

**REMARKS**

A review of the claims indicates that:

A) Claims 23, 28, 29, 31 and 38 are currently amended.

B) Claims 24—27, 30, 32—34, 36, 37, 39—41, 43 and 44 are previously presented.

C) Claims 35 and 42 are currently cancelled.

D) Claims 1—22 were cancelled earlier.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims and withdrawal of the rejections.

**Traversal of the §102 Rejections**

Claims 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34 and 36 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,549,654, hereinafter “Kumada” in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,161,710, hereinafter “MacLeod.” In response, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Claim 23** recites a method printing, comprising:

- obtaining color space requirements of a document to be printed, wherein the requirements define a boundary of a color space associated with the document;
- obtaining a rendering intent from an author;
- selecting a printer from among a plurality of printers based on a best fit as determined by the color space requirements of the document, the rendering intent of the author and gamuts of each of the plurality of printers, wherein each gamut defines a boundary of a device colors space indicating colors printable by the printer; and
- determining if color mapping is needed, and if so selecting a color map from a selection comprising:
  - a first color map based on an absolute colorimetric rendering intent; and
  - a second color map based on perceptual rendering intent;
- wherein selecting based on the best-fit comprises:

- comparing the color space requirements of the document with a device colors space of each of two or more printers; and
- comparing how well each printer would respond to an author's indicated preference for absolute colorimetric rendering intent or perceptual rendering intent.

Claim 23 has been amended to recite subject matter of Claim 35, which was found to be allowable in combination with Claim 31. The Applicant respectfully submits that the addition of the subject matter of Claim 35 to Claim 1 is allowable for at least the same reasons that the subject matter is allowable in combination with Claim 31.

In particular, the first paragraphs of Claims 23 and 31 recite aspects of obtaining color space requirements of a document to be printed. The second paragraph in each claim recites aspects of information from an author. In the third paragraph of both claims recite aspects of best fit. In the fourth paragraph of both claims recite aspects of selecting a color map. In the fifth/sixth paragraphs of both claims recite colorimetric and perceptual rendering intents. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that the similarity between Claims 23 and 31 is such that the allowability of Claims 31+35 implies that Claims 1+35 are also allowable.

The Applicant has amended Claim 23 to specifically recite colorimetric and perceptual rendering intents, rather than describing those intents. Accordingly, the recited subject matter is roughly equivalent.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 23, as amended, is allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 35 was found to be allowable.

**Claims 24—30** depend from Claim 23 and are allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for

1 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 23, are  
2 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in  
3 combination with one another.

4 **Claim 31** has been amended to recite the subject matter of Claim 35, and is  
5 therefore thought to be in allowable condition. Claim 35 was objected to as  
6 depending from a non-allowed claim. Accordingly, the amendment of Claim 31 to  
7 recite the elements of Claim 35 brings Claim 31 into condition for allowance.

8 Claim 31 has also been amended to remove two “wherein” clauses that  
9 describe absolute colorimetric rendering intent and perceptual rendering intent,  
10 respectively. Because the wherein clauses describe the two rendering intents, the  
11 Applicant submits that the amendment does not effectively change the scope of the  
12 claim. Therefore, Claim 31 has been amended to recite the elements of allowable  
13 Claim 35, and is in condition for allowance.

14 **Claim 38** has been amended to recite the subject matter of allowable Claim  
15 42, and is therefore in allowable condition.

16 **Claims 32—37 and 39—44** depend from Claims 31 and 38 and are  
17 allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are  
18 also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those  
19 recited in Claims 31 and 38, are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of  
20 record, either singly or in combination with one another.

### 21 **Conclusion**

22 The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance  
23 and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Office’s  
24 next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the  
25

1 Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for  
2 scheduling an interview.

3  
4 Respectfully Submitted,

5  
6 Dated: 10-5-07

7  
8 By: 

9 David S. Thompson  
10 Reg. No. 37,954  
11 Attorney for Applicant

12 LEE & HAYES PLLC  
13 Suite 500  
14 421 W. Riverside Avenue  
15 Spokane, Washington 99201

16 Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235  
17 Facsimile: (509) 323-8979  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25